



2011

**NFLRC SUMMER INSTITUTE:
ONLINE LEARNING COMMUNITIES
FOR LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT
LANGUAGES**

EVALUATION REPORT

July 11–15, 2011

Bonnie Sylwester

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Sylwester, B. (2012). *2011 NFLRC summer institute: Online learning communities for less commonly taught languages*. (NetWork #63) [PDF document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center. doi: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/14558>

The contents of this NetWork were developed under a grant from the Department of Education (CFDA 84.229, P229A990002). However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Overview	4
The Evaluation	6
Findings.....	7
Daily Mini-Surveys	7
Final Survey.....	8
Comments and Open-Ended Responses.....	9
Conclusion.....	10
Appendices	11
Appendix A.....	11
Appendix B.....	14
Appendix C.....	18
Appendix D.....	27

Executive Summary

The NFLRC's 2011 summer institute took place from July 11-15, 2011. The theme of the institute was Online Learning Communities for Less Commonly Taught Languages. Several mini-surveys and one final survey were administered to evaluate the institute. This page summarizes the main findings of the evaluation. For more detailed discussion of results, as well as reporting of qualitative and quantitative data, please refer to the main report and appendices.

Participants

- 32 participants from around the US and the Asia-Pacific region attended the summer institute.
- Languages represented included Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Samoan, and Vietnamese.

Organizational Features

- In general, participants were highly satisfied with the logistical arrangements for the summer institute and felt the institute was very well organized.
- Participants particularly liked the welcoming reception.
- Participants were less satisfied with certain aspects of the accommodations; in particular the lack of phone service was a problem for some participants.

Program Goals

- Participants expressed high levels of confidence in their abilities to understand the issues and topics outlined in the goals for each day. Overall ratings were very high.
- Participants were most confident in areas related to establishing partnerships and building communities.
- Participants were least confident in their abilities to assess student learning and evaluate their projects.
- Other areas that participants found challenging included designing detailed content, using Tag Cloud technology, and planning for future project-related research.

Program Elements

- One aspect of the program that participants found particularly useful was the opportunity to interact with and learn from other participants. This included interacting with participants from their own language teams as well as learning from other language teams.
- Participants recommended incorporating more hands-on learning opportunities into the instruction. This included interspersing more hands-on practice within general instruction and also allowing more time for work on team projects.

Overview

The National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) held the summer institute, Online Learning Communities for Less Commonly Taught Languages, at the University of Hawaii at Manoa on July 11-15, 2011. The summer institute brought together foreign language educators from a variety of less commonly taught languages for the purpose of helping them learn how to develop and use online learning communities to facilitate language learning. During the workshop participants worked in language teams to design and develop their own online learning communities. These communities will be implemented in the coming academic year.

Program: The five-day program (see Appendix A) included daily plenary sessions which provided participants with necessary technical or pedagogical information for developing online learning communities, breakout sessions in which language teams worked on developing their projects, and plenary sessions called “True Confessions” in which each team reported on its progress. There were also open lab sessions during lunch and at the end of each day that allowed language teams to work further on their projects. In addition to the workshop sessions, the NFLRC also organized social and dining activities such as a welcome reception on the first day, a closing luncheon on the final day and a daily continental breakfast.

Staff: Facilitators included Sabine Levet (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), David Hiple (NFLRC), Stephen Tschudi (NFLRC), and Jim Yoshioka (NFLRC). Dorothy Chun also presented via Skype on day 4. Technical support staff from the UH Language Learning Center included Richard Medina, Clayton Chee, Randall Parabolicoli, and Tobias Bloyd.

Participants: A total of 32 participants from around the US and the Asia-Pacific region took part in the institute (see Appendix D). Participants came from high schools, community colleges, and university language programs, and represented six different languages. The number of participants representing each language was as follows:

Chinese	7
Japanese	2
Korean	2
Russian	5
Samoan	11
Vietnamese	5

Collaborating Organizations: The institute was a collaborative effort involving the University of Hawaii’s College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literatures (CLLL), the Center for Pacific Islands Studies (CPIS), the National Resource Center for East Asia (NRCEA), and the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), as well as the Korean, Russian, and Chinese Flagship programs at various institutions (see Appendix D).

In planning the institute, the NFLRC developed the following vision, mission, and daily goals.

Vision: Participants will form a collaborative learning community that will provide mutual support as they design and build their projects: Web-based virtual spaces facilitating the formation of communities of practice, tailored to specific needs of educational populations that make significant differences in the education and careers of students and professional colleagues. Participants will initiate their projects, reflect on their experiences, and plan ahead for sharing the results with professional colleagues.

Mission: Provide a supportive, motivating atmosphere for participants. Provide all technological and informational tools that participants need to successfully design, build, launch, use, evaluate, and report on their online learning community projects. Provide an online "home" for participants to return to as they work toward realizing their project plans and toward researching their results to present to colleagues.

Daily Participant Goals:

Summer Institute Workshop Day 1 - July 11 (Monday)

- Understand the vision, mission, and goals of the workshop.
- Understand significant challenges and variables in determining overall content, establishing partnerships and building community, and defining institutional parameters for online intercultural exchanges, taking Cultura and its daughter projects as a point of departure.

Summer Institute Workshop Day 2 - July 12 (Tuesday)

- Understand significant challenges and variables in determining the design of detailed content and sequences of activities/tasks, the role of language learning, and the appropriate use of media in an online intercultural exchange, taking Cultura as a point of departure.
- Understand the potential of Interactive Tag Cloud technology as a tool for use in your exchange

Summer Institute Workshop Day 3 - July 13 (Wednesday)

- Understand significant challenges and variables connected with determining the role of the teacher and the students, fostering online community and cohesion, and designing evaluations of student performance in online intercultural exchanges.

Summer Institute Workshop Day 4 - July 14 (Thursday)

- Understand significant challenges and variables in engaging in reflective practice and sharing research results connected with online intercultural exchanges. Be aware of ongoing requirements for the maintenance of your community.

The Evaluation

To evaluate the summer institute, the NFLRC developed a series of very brief, daily “mini-surveys” as well as a longer survey administered at the end of the institute. Surveys were designed to gather feedback on two areas: (a) intended outcomes based on the goals identified in the previous section; (b) organizational and logistical aspects of the institute, such as food and technical support. Surveys were administered online through the summer institute webpage. Survey completion rates for each day were as follows:

Day 1 Mini-Survey:	27 submissions
Day 2 Mini-Survey:	25 submissions
Day 3 Mini-Survey:	26 submissions
Day 4 Mini-Survey:	25 submissions
Final Survey:	26 submissions

In addition, facilitators elicited formative feedback during the institute through daily reporting sessions in which each language team reported on its progress.

Evaluation Limitations: The workshop was designed to provide participants with the necessary skills, tools, and collaborative relationships to *begin* developing their projects. However, implementation of the online learning communities will not take place until the fall or spring semesters of AY 2011-2012. Therefore, mid- and long-term outcomes regarding the implementation and impact of the online learning communities cannot be evaluated yet. Follow-up evaluations regarding the participants’ abilities to use what they learned in the workshop to implement and maintain their online learning communities and the impact and outcomes of the learning communities will need to be conducted in future years.

Due to a miscommunication, two rating scales were used on the surveys (a four-point Likert scale and a five-point Likert scale). This makes comparisons difficult. Readers are urged to view findings with this limitation in mind. It is strongly recommended that only one rating scale, either four-point or five-point, be used in surveys for future summer institutes.

Findings

Daily Mini-Surveys

The daily mini-surveys indicate that the summer institute was highly successful in meeting its daily goals for participants. (See Appendix B for detailed mini-survey results.) When daily averages for the participants' ratings of the goals are calculated, Day 2 seems to have been the most challenging (Daily mean = 3.17). Comments for day 2 indicated that participants struggled with two aspects of the workshop: (a) how to select and sequence detailed content; and (b) Tag Cloud technology.

The individual survey items from the daily mini-surveys have been compiled and listed in order of highest to lowest rating in Table 1 below¹. As all goals received ratings of $M \geq 3.0$ out of 4.0, participants appear confident that they were able to learn the material well. The ratings indicate that participants were most confident in their understandings of the issues involved in establishing partnerships and building community ($M=3.67$). They were least confident in their understandings of issues involved in designing evaluations of student performance ($M= 3.00$). Facilitators may wish to pay particular attention to this and the other goals found at the bottom of the list for future workshops and follow-up support.

Table 1

In the context of designing an online community for intercultural exchange, how well did you understand the significant issues and main ideas involved in...?	Average (M)	N
Establishing partnerships and building community	3.67	27
Determining overall content	3.48	27
Engaging in reflective practice	3.44	25
Determining the role of the teacher	3.42	26
Defining institutional parameters	3.41	27
Coordinating work among institutions	3.41	27
Fostering online community and cohesion	3.38	26
Sharing research results	3.36	25
Determining the role of the students	3.35	26
Determining the appropriate use of media	3.24	25
Sequencing activities/tasks	3.20	25
Maintenance of an online community	3.17	24
The design of detailed content	3.16	25
Role of language learning	3.08	25
Designing evaluations of student performance	3.00	26

(Rating Scale 1-4, 1 = Not at all, 4 = Very well)

¹ In comparing daily participant goals, only those goals using the four-point scale have been included.

Final Survey

The final survey solicited feedback on a five-point Likert scale with five being the highest rating and one being the lowest (See Appendix C for detailed final survey results). All items on the survey rated highly ($M \geq 4.31$) indicating a high level of overall satisfaction with the summer institute. Open-ended questions also received generally positive responses.

The survey organized items into six categories: (1) pre-institute arrangements, (2) workshop content, (3) project development, (4) team collaboration and support, (5) social events and activities, and (6) future research. Of these categories, pre-institute arrangements and social events and activities both rated very highly ($M=4.74$ and 4.71 respectively). Future research received the lowest ratings ($M=4.33$), although the results are still quite high.

The individual survey items have been listed in order of highest to lowest rating in Table 2 below:

Table 2

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of these statements:	Average (M)	N
I enjoyed the Welcoming Reception on the first day (if applicable) ² .	4.96	26
My travel arrangements were handled in a timely and convenient manner (if applicable).	4.84	19
The workshop facilities and environment were conducive to our team's work.	4.81	26
Morning and afternoon coffee service and refreshments were satisfactory.	4.81	26
Participants on my team collaborated effectively as we designed and built our project together.	4.77	26
The workshop was well organized and run.	4.76	25
The information and communications received prior to the summer institute were satisfactory for my needs.	4.72	25
The workshop facilitators and staff provided satisfactory instruction and support.	4.69	26
The workshop provided an online "home" for our team to return to as we work toward realizing our project plans.	4.68	25
The pre-Institute effort to identify institutional partners for our team was useful for our project.	4.65	26
The design of my team's project was tailored to meet the specific needs of our target educational population.	4.64	25

² This item was accidentally listed twice. The first listing received 26 responses and a rating of $M=4.96$. The second listing received 18 responses and a rating of $M= 4.89$. As the first listing received the most responses, it has been included in this table. The second listing was excluded as it was considered redundant for the purposes of this table.

The workshop provided ample opportunity for participants to reflect on their experiences in the workshop.	4.50	26
My team created a satisfactory Web-based space that will facilitate the formation of our intended community of practice.	4.48	25
The workshop provided the information participants needed to successfully design, build, and launch their online learning community projects.	4.46	26
The workshop provided the technological tools participants needed to successfully design, build, and launch their online learning community projects.	4.42	26
I am confident I will successfully conduct the online learning project.	4.36	25
There were sufficient opportunities to network and socialize during the summer institute.	4.35	26
The workshop prepared participants to plan ahead for sharing research results with professional colleagues.	4.35	26
The workshop prepared participants to plan ahead for performing project-related research.	4.31	26
The workshop provided the information participants needed to successfully evaluate their online learning community projects.	4.31	26

(Rating Scale 1-5, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

In addition to issues related to researching and disseminating information on projects, participants indicated that they are least confident in their abilities to evaluate their projects. This, when combined with the item that ranked lowest on the daily mini-surveys, *designing evaluations of student performance*, indicates that facilitators may wish to spend more time on evaluation and assessment in the follow-up support they provide.

Comments and Open-Ended Responses

What did participants particularly like? Participants particularly appreciated that the summer institute was well organized. In addition to a well-planned program, they also commented that the technical support and logistical aspects ran smoothly. In terms of sessions, participants commented that they learned a great deal from the opportunities to interact and learn from other participants. This included both working with their own language teams and hearing about the work of other language teams:

- *The opportunity to interact with and learn from so many fine colleagues*
- *Very beneficial because different language teams work toward different themes and different approaches, thus very eye-opening.*
- *Watching other languages and their proposals and approaches was also beneficial as these gave some good possibilities that we could also follow and use.*
- *I think the opportunity to collaborate in person with my flagship colleagues was invaluable*
- *I really like the discussion and presentation portions. We could have learned a lot of insight from other language teams.*

What could have been done better? In response to the question, “What could have been done better?” many participants simply took the time to thank the NFLRC for an excellent summer institute, and did

not necessarily recommend any changes. However, some commented on the need for more hands-on learning opportunities, especially practice with BRIX and more time to work on projects:

- *More participation or hands on learning rather than lecture style.*
- *More hands-on activities*
- *A shorter introduction to one or two Cafe/Cultura/BRIX features followed by a shorter period of team work during which new questions would emerge.*
- *I think we should have more instruction on how to navigate and use BRIX. Most of us are still not very confident in using it. If we were to continue with this project at home institutions we need to be able to be fluent (or at least proficient) with it.*
- *More time for project design*

Finally, in the Pre-Institute Arrangements section, some participants took the time to comment on the lack of services available where they stayed at Frear Hall. In particular the lack of telephone service was cause for concern among some participants who were not sure how they would be able to contact anyone in case of problems or an emergency. The NFLRC may want to address this for future workshops or at least to let participants know what to expect regarding services at these accommodations prior to arrival.

- *All arrangements were handled extremely well, however, the hotel itself was very uncomfortable. Please consider using a different hotel in the future.*
- *The Frear Hall is very new and convenient to the Language Learning Center, however, there is no telephone, fridge, television, kitchen or daily change of linen. In case of emergency, we need a telephone as we do not have mobile phones to call... I did not feel secured as there was no attendant at the desk most of the time at night.*
- *A better organisation of place to stay would have avoided my ending up not knowing who to contact should emergencies arise... I struggled to find out how to get fresh linen etc. No phone also meant I could have needed emergency at night and no one was around to call upon.*

Conclusion

Feedback indicates that the NFLRC's 2011 summer institute was well organized and highly successful in achieving its immediate goals. Participants expressed confidence that they were able to understand the significant issues involved in designing, implementing, and maintaining online learning communities. They also seemed satisfied with their teams and the partnerships they established, and they were enthusiastic about moving forward with their projects. Naturally, follow-up support will be necessary to assist participants with implementing and sustaining their projects. (Assessment of student learning and project evaluation and research may be areas where participants need extra support as these were areas for which they expressed some lack of confidence.) While additional evaluation will be necessary to gauge the mid- and long-term outcomes of this project, both quantitative and qualitative data indicate that short-term learning goals have been achieved and participants were very satisfied with the institute.

Appendices

Appendix A



Summer Institute 2011 -- Schedule of activities

Workshop: Online Learning Communities for Less Commonly Taught Languages

Vision: Participants will form a collaborative learning community that will provide mutual support as they design and build their projects: Web-based virtual spaces facilitating the formation of communities of practice, tailored to specific needs of educational populations, that make significant differences in the education and careers of students and professional colleagues. Participants will initiate their projects, reflect on their experiences, and plan ahead for sharing the results with professional colleagues.

Mission: Provide a supportive, motivating atmosphere for participants. Provide all technological and informational tools that participants need to successfully design, build, launch, use, evaluate, and report on their online learning community projects. Provide an online "home" for participants to return to as they work toward realizing their project plans and toward researching their results to present to colleagues.

*Plenary sessions will be held in **Faculty Development Lab (Moore Hall 155B)**. Breakout sessions are as follow:*

- Media Room (155A) – Chinese team
- Faculty Development Lab (155B) – Russian, Japanese, & Korean teams
- PC Lab (153A) – Samoan team
- MCL Viewing Room (156) – Vietnamese team

Summer Institute Workshop Day 1 - July 11 (Monday)

Participant goals:

Understand the **vision, mission, and goals** of the workshop.

Understand significant challenges and variables in determining **overall content, establishing partnerships and building community, and defining institutional parameters (including coordinating work among institutions)** for online intercultural exchanges, taking Cultura as a point of departure.

Sequence:

- 8:30-9:00 Continental breakfast – open lab
- 9:00-10:00 Welcome, introductions, goals – Considerations for utilizing inter-institutional online learning environments – David Hipple
- 10:00-10:30 Introduction to workshop groups
- 10:30-10:45 Break
- 10:45-12:00 Online tour of Cultura-inspired learning models – Sabine Levet & Stephen Tschudi

12:00-1:00 Lunch – open lab
 1:00-2:00 Discussion: Analyzing characteristics of sample projects
 2:00-3:00 Negotiating parameters of **your** model – team breakout
 3:00-3:15 Break
 3:15-4:15 Reporting on your group's parameters
 4:15-5:00 Complete mini-survey; Introduction to the workshop discussion forum (plenary, followed by breakout to work online)
 Reception to follow -- NFLRC lanai

Summer Institute Workshop Day 2 - July 12 (Tuesday)

Participant goals:

Understand significant challenges and variables in determining the design of **detailed content and sequences of activities/tasks, the role of language learning**, and the appropriate **use of media** in an online intercultural exchange, taking Cultura as a point of departure. Understand the potential of the **BRIX courseware system & Interactive Tag Cloud technology** as a tool for use in your exchange.

Sequence:

8:30-9:00 Continental breakfast – open lab
 9:00-10:15 Defining detailed content and sequences of activities and tasks, the role of language learning, and the use of media in an online intercultural exchange project – Sabine Levet
 10:15-10:30 Break
 10:30-11:30 Discussion: Analyzing characteristics of sample projects
 11:30-12:00 Post in workshop forums
 12:00-1:00 Lunch – open lab
 1:00-2:00 Technology Options: Introduction to the BRIX courseware system and Interactive Tag Cloud technology – Stephen Tschudi & Richard Medina
 2:00-3:00 Launching your project plan – teams (prepare to report)
 3:00-3:15 Break
 3:15-3:45 Report on project plans (5 minutes per team)
 3:45-4:30 Project planning, individual assignments within groups
 4:30-5:00 Complete mini-survey, post in workshop forum

Summer Institute Workshop Day 3 - July 13 (Wednesday)

Participant goals:

Understand significant challenges and variables connected with determining the role of **the teacher and the students**, fostering **online community and cohesion**, and designing **evaluations of student performance** in online intercultural exchanges.

Sequence:

8:30-9:00 Continental breakfast – open lab
 9:00-10:15 Understanding the role of teacher and students, fostering community and cohesion, and designing evaluations of student performance in online and hybrid exchanges – Sabine Levet & Stephen Tschudi
 10:15-10:30 Break

10:30-12:00	Project work
12:00-1:00	Lunch – open lab
1:00-3:15	Project work
3:15-3:30	Break
3:30-4:30	How's it going? True confessions (10 minutes per group)
4:30-5:00	Complete mini-survey, post in workshop forum
5:00-6:00	Lei-making (optional) – NFLRC lanai
5:00-6:00	Open labs (optional)

Summer Institute Workshop Day 4 - July 14 (Thursday)

Participant goals:

Understand significant challenges and variables **in engaging in reflective practice** and **sharing research results** connected with online intercultural exchanges. Be aware of ongoing requirements for the **maintenance of your community**.

Sequence:

8:30-9:00	Continental breakfast – open lab
9:00-10:00	Considerations for reflective practice and research – Dorothy Chun via Skype
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-12:00	Project work
12:00-1:00	Lunch – open lab
1:00-3:15	Project work
3:15-3:30	Break
3:30-4:00	Maintaining an online community – Sabine Levet & Stephen Tschudi
4:00-4:30	How's it going? True confessions (5 minutes per group)
4:30-5:00	Complete mini-survey, post in workshop forum
5:00-6:00	Open labs (optional)

Summer Institute Workshop Day 5 - July 15 (Friday)

Participant goals:

Finish preparatory work and share your group's plan and progress in implementing your intercultural exchange project. Evaluate this workshop.

Sequence:

8:30-9:00	Continental breakfast – open lab
9:00-11:00	Finish up project work – perform workshop evaluation
11:00-1:00	Project presentations (20 minutes per group)
1:00-2:00	Closing luncheon

Appendix B

Daily Mini-Survey Results

Day 1 Results

Question 1 Rating Scale 1-5, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree		
	Average (M)	N
I understood the vision, mission, and goals of the workshop	4.44	27

Question 2 Rating Scale 1-4, 1 = Not at all, 4 = Very well		
In the context of designing an online community for intercultural exchange, how well did you understand the significant issues involved in...?	Average (M)	N
Determining overall content	3.48	27
Establishing partnerships and building community	3.67	27
Defining institutional parameters	3.41	27
Coordinating work among institutions	3.41	27
Daily Average	3.49	

Day 1 Comments

- The potential is great, yet I don't know all of the pitfalls that might come later. That is, the devil will be in the details.
- Many challenges ahead but much enthusiasm in our group.
- Going great!
- The four main ideas were very well defined and elaborated. The institutions who participated in the epathways learning before gives me much insight into the benefits for students learning Samoan at [my institution].
- The break out into language groups was the most productive part of the day! I understand how vital it is for talk to occur but it kind of threw me off today... too much talking I thought. Although it was needed to bring everyone up to date with what cultura is, etc., it was redundant for me because I participated in the 2008 workshop so it felt like it was a repeat for me.
- Although I feel there are other parameters we can address for the ecafes, the parameters laid out in this workshop will suffice to achieve its overall goal. I hope to adapt some of these parameters and expand a little bit more on it, to pilot other possibilities of expanding ecafes, and standardizing it into a school curriculum.
- Still learning.
- Very excited and looking forward to the end product.
- Many issues still to be worked out, one of which is that creating online materials and sites takes much more time and labor than one might suspect which, given our current workloads, could end up presenting problems. Another question would be: if online communities are to be an integral part of a given language course currently on the books, what part of that course would have to be eliminated in order to make room for this new approach? How would this affect the overall program in that given language, especially one in which there are only two or three of active faculty members in any given semester?

- This workshop (Day 1) is very stimulating, not only in building online community (although am not clear about coordinating work among institutions) but also suggesting ideas to explore various teaching approaches and building materials in traditional classroom contexts.
- For the first day I think we have made good progress in terms of negotiating parameters for our team and hopefully the details of the project will be more defined as we move through the week.

Day 2 Results

Question 1		
Rating Scale 1-4, 1 = Not at all, 4 = Very well		
In the context of designing an online community for intercultural exchange, I understood the main ideas involved in...	Average (M)	N
The design of detailed content	3.16	25
Sequencing activities/tasks	3.20	25
Role of language learning	3.08	25
Determining the appropriate use of media	3.24	25
Daily Average	3.17	

Questions 2 and 3		
Rating Scale 1-5, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree		
	Average (M)	N
2) I understood the potential of the BRIX course management system as a tool for use in an exchange	4.24	25
3) I understood the potential of Interactive Tag Cloud technology as a tool for use in an exchange	3.56	25

Day 2 Comments

- My marks above are not based on the potential of the ideas under discussion, which is great, but the specific applicability to Flagship Chinese programs. We are still trying to work out the WHAT and HOW, and until we do a clear picture of how the technology/design can assist us won't emerge. It's the kind of project that will make perfect sense once we identify all the parts.
- Excellent presentations. Projects are starting to come together.
- Going...
- In order to sequence the tasks, I would like to know more about what the theoretical grounds are for linguistic, cultural, and performative features of each task. What are the constructs of each tasks and what task demands are you manipulating in order for students to reach certain learning outcomes? Clarifying the expected learner performance will be particularly important when it comes to assessment.
- The tag cloud seemed like a great idea as an activity, but brix seems better for broader language learning goals.
- It's difficult to determine exact content without consultation with our Russian partner and input from the students.
- Need more on tag clouds. I use "dropbox" on google.
- I have to readapt the design of detailed content to suit the needs of students. I have to speed up my technical skills to determine the appropriate use of media. I may have to focus on the sequencing activities/tasks and on the role of language learning as these two points are very crucial.
- Good to know that online course adopted from Cultura is not static and is still moving forward.
- wish we have more time to go into detail....!!!

- Goals need to be well stated at the beginning of the project and then continuously reinforced as the project progresses. Goals are clarified not to the extent that administrators/teachers do not shape student responses to questions posted on the forum, rather shape their "process of inquiry" as Levett, S. puts it, to produce constructive and lively message threads.
- The content of the presentation was very interesting but I was unable to take note. I would like to be able to retain the information.
- Very interesting but somewhat overloaded with so much information furnished so quickly - I would do better if I were about 17 years old and born into the digital generation.
- I have to admit that I couldn't really visualize how Tag Cloud technology could serve as a tool for our future project. I feel more comfortable using BRIX for our future project.

Day 3 Results

Question 1		
Rating Scale 1-4, 1 = Not at all, 4 = Very well		
In the context of designing an online community for intercultural exchange, I understood the significant issues in...	Average (M)	N
Determining the role of the teacher	3.42	26
Determining the role of the students	3.35	26
Fostering online community and cohesion	3.38	26
Designing evaluations of student performance	3.00	26
Daily Average	3.29	

Day 3 Comments

- I think we are getting the hang of this project – at least we are making good progress. Assessment still looks like an issue – it'll be a matter of selecting specific activities that have clear outcomes and output that can be graded.
- We are getting there in the Chinese group and will actually work with brix tomorrow. Excellent work today!
- Example rubrics or criteria would have helped.
- I found BRIX frustrating.
- the presentations over the last day have helped our group talk through what model of an online community work best for all institutions involved. Having work time in our groups today gave me the opportunity to put my thoughts in order and contribute much to the group discussions.
- At this point I'm thinking it might have been good to do the general overview of the project (some of the things we spoke about on Monday) prior to the workshop – perhaps a webinar? That way, we could have more time to collaborate on our individual projects, which I'm finding is taking more time than anticipated. Other than that, I'm really enjoying this opportunity to collaborate with my flagship colleagues!
- need more time
- Thanks, teacher role and students role were very well presented, explained and exemplified. Online community and cohesion will be challenges as the idea may take some time to sell the positive aspects of it to others (?).
- need more time
- Great discussions today on our mission statement ☺ Language was key!!

Day 4 Results

Question 1

Rating Scale 1-4, 1 = Not at all, 4 = Very well		
In the context of designing an online community for intercultural exchange, I understood the significant challenges and variables involved in...		
Engaging in reflective practice	Average (M)	N
Engaging in reflective practice	3.44	25
Sharing research results	3.36	25
Maintenance of an online community	3.17	24
Daily Average	3.32	

Day 4 Comments

- The morning session was not very useful!
- I didn't find Dorothy's presentation very useful. It was pitched at the wrong level (and perhaps to the wrong purpose). The questions and method presented are fairly self-evident.
- We're getting there! Thanks.
- I would like to get the ppt presented for the lecture during workshop. If it is not available for the public, I'd like to get the references because I want to know the full name of author and title so that i can refer to them for my future research. Thank you.
- (=
- I liked having more time to work with my team on our own cafe, but I wish we had spent a little more time on day 2 and/or 3 on the logistics of the brix site. I think we spent a lot of time trying to figure out the logistics of the site, instead of focusing on the content of our cafe. On a more positive note, I'm very happy we had an opportunity to meet with our flagship colleagues to collaborate on a larger research agenda across languages. That time was invaluable! Thanks for inviting us here, so we could make that happen!
- Action research paradigm is very important for teachers in the classroom situation as reflection on researching learning outcome is much more authentic.
Indeed, sharing new and or raw knowledge is a 'must' in comparison to authentic intellectual property rights.
- good job
- There is still more to learn from our own project to better understand the challenges involved.
- really need help on the technical part of the project
- Did not get a chance to cover maintaining an online community, however, in our group discussions with the tech reps, we were able to pick up a few pointers that reference to the subject matter. Hopefully tomorrow we will touch basis on subject.
- It is good that the progressive build-up of the knowledge to be learnt from this institute became clearer as we learnt new things each day that built on previous day.
- Gathering data and using that data for pedagogical research could be an excellent goal for these cafés – however, our group's needs are such that this will probably not be a proximate activity for any of the four units we represent. Because one of the primary goals of our OLCs will be the eventual articulation of the GUAVA member institutions, including several universities now presently participating in this workshop, it is entirely possible that faculty members at those institutions will indeed be interested accessing and in using the data derived from the cafés for SLS research.
- I enjoyed the presentation from Dorothy Chun this morning and I thought some of her points on action research were very helpful in giving us ideas to reflect on the importance of learning outcomes, as well as to think about the activities to allow us to get evidence for our research questions.

Appendix C

Final Survey Results

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of these statements:

Rating Scale 1-5,

1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree

1) Pre-Institute Arrangements	Average (M)	N
The pre-Institute effort to identify institutional partners for our team was useful for our project.	4.65	26
The information and communications received prior to the summer institute were satisfactory for my needs.	4.72	25
My travel arrangements were handled in a timely and convenient manner (if applicable).	4.84	19

Please add any information you wish that will help us understand your ratings above.

- Terrific support. Special thanks to Jim Yoshioka.
- Excellent pre-institute communication; very thorough and informative
- Very good job!
- I don't understand the first question. Do you mean domestic partners or the international partner? The pre-Institute SKYPE conference was certainly helpful, and having participants from each of the domestic Russian Flagship programs was wonderful.
- All arrangements were handled extremely well, however, the hotel itself was very uncomfortable. Please consider using a different hotel in the future.
- Jim made the travel-planning process so easy! I think it would be good to do part of the workshop overview prior to arrival, so that teams can maximize their time on individual projects,
- may be to be more clear or in advance with our check in schedule and more time to prepare for our workshop.
- The Frear Hall is very new and convenient to the Language Learning Center, however, there is no telephone, fridge, television, kitchen or daily change of linen. In case of emergency, we need a telephone as we do not have mobile phones to call 111. I did not feel secured as there was no attendant at the desk most of the time at night.
- A better organisation of place to stay would have avoided my ending up not knowing who to contact should emergencies arise due to medical health for instance. Probably because we stayed in a 'new' (Frear) hall no one there at the front desk knew what group I belonged to as my name was not on their blackboard-so I struggled to find out how to get fresh linen etc. No phone also meant I could have needed emergency at night and no one was around to call upon.
- It was so handy to receive clear directives in terms of dates and logistics prior to the institute. I commend Jim for this tremendous effort before and during the week. It made life more comfortable.
- We received exactly the sort of information needed, not too much to overload the mailbox, not too little to get puzzled.
Because Center for Southeast Asian Studies invited us, Dr. O'Harrow worked nicely to put together a team that worked very well together and complement one another. We cannot do a good job without any of the members of 4 institutions.

- Thank you so much for everything!
- this evaluation is submitted on behalf of the whole Vietnamese team, Arizona, Cornell, Florida, and Hawaii, with our deepest thanks to NFLRC/Hawaii for making this all possible.

2) Workshop Content	Average (M)	N
The workshop provided the information participants needed to successfully design, build, and launch their online learning community projects.	4.46	26
The workshop provided the technological tools participants needed to successfully design, build, and launch their online learning community projects.	4.42	26
The workshop provided the information participants needed to successfully evaluate their online learning community projects.	4.31	26
The workshop facilitators and staff provided satisfactory instruction and support.	4.69	26
The workshop was well organized and run.	4.76	25

Please add any information you wish that will help us understand your ratings above.

- The staff and workshop facilitators were excellent. We were encouraged and guided in building our project. The NFLRC staff are consistently professional and cheerful in working with each group.
- Thank you very much for this opportunity.
Also I greatly appreciate help of two graduate students.
- I think in general the workshop went very well. To comment on BRIX usability, I think it would be helpful for the navigation to be updated a little so that, for example, under the unit we do not have to add a language tool in order to post a narration. I feel that I have to click several times to get where I need to be in the system. I would like to also see some of the language for navigation to match that of Facebook and other social media. I think this would help us and our students avoid a rocky transition to using this site.
- need more heavy refreshments other than just nuts and buns and chips...etc
- It is an honour and privilege to be invited to the workshop. I have learned a lot from this learning curve of my teaching career. I am looking forward to this implement this new practical experience into practice next semester at [my institution]. I am sure that the participants of the ... ePathway Cafe will be excited to make connection to other students learning Samoan worldwide.
- The theoretical framework from which the Cafe is based on is concise, clear and comprehensible.
- I enjoyed the friendly but well organised presentations by all the presenters. Knowing one of them well over a number of years helped a great deal as well.
- This is my second workshop and BRIX and CULTURA are much clearer and forming teams and designing expectations and implementation goals and tasks were much easier to achieve this time. I will need to hone in on how to design evaluation and other data collection tools.
- I would have liked to see more of the cultura model applied in the teaching at the workshop. Use the culuture to learn the language. More participation fewer power point presentations that don't incluld some hands on participation.
- It would've have been very beneficial for participants to take part in a cultura-like model course instead of being "told" about it. I would also have appreciated more team planning time earlier in the workshop.
- Other than that, it was a great experience learning from each Language Team. Malo lava!

- It would have been helpful if we had more time to study how to use, navigate and test BRIX. Most of us hadn't heard of it before so most of our group time we were just trying to learn how use this new tool. The technical team was very wonderful when we needed help but it would have been more beneficial if there was a general presentation on what to expect prior to our group work. Overall, I have a very pleasant experience and I will take away new useful information. Thank you all! MAHALO!
- The non-technical part was excellent and adequate, but the technical support did not match, perhaps because there was not enough time to train workshop participants in using those tools efficiently, when some of us are shy away from tech details (or lack of passion).
All in all, this is an excellent workshop and very inspiring, for me, not only in designing the online language learning linguistically and culturally, but also designing courses taught in traditional classroom settings (e.g., comparing views from various sides for a course on the Vietnam War on cinemas). I've learned a lot, and appreciate the opportunities to learn from colleagues in other language groups. Mahalo. Cam on! :)
- Thank you for planning, organizing, and running a great workshop. We hope not to be able to have our project launch next spring but also plan to encourage other GUAVA members to join and create other OLCs.
- This project will form the basis of an important initiative to bring the GUAVA member institutions into a collaborative effort at articulating and upgrading our many programs across the United States.

3) Project Development	Average (M)	N
The design of my team's project was tailored to meet the specific needs of our target educational population.	4.64	25
My team created a satisfactory Web-based space that will facilitate the formation of our intended community of practice.	4.48	25
The workshop provided an online "home" for our team to return to as we work toward realizing our project plans.	4.68	25
I am confident I will successfully conduct the online learning project.	4.36	25

Please add any information you wish that will help us understand your ratings above.

- The coordination among different cohorts is a consideration.
- Our team still has some challenges to fit the material to our needs, but we made significant progress.
- Our team was a little behind in designing our online learning project--largely due to the complexities involved. I am satisfied that we are now on track to success in launching the project.
- we still need more time on the technology part of the workshop
- Prior learning and practical experiences of the Hawaiian educational institutions participants are very helpful for me. I feel very much confident to carry on with the ePathway Cafe.
- I feel confident that even though i have not operated this programme before, that with the technologically savvy team we have in the Samoan group, that i should be able to get it to work with their assistance. Malo lava team!
- With a very enthusiastic team we have right now, I think we going to launch yet another successful project starting fall semester.
- Perhaps a couple more days together would have allowed us to design more detailed modules for our students, do a more hands on with the technology. But perhaps this will come as we implement our plan.

- More time to practice would have raised the last one to strongly agree.
- Please see the comment earlier comment above the lowest rating. Not you, but us :).
- Some of the members of our team may not feel as comfortable with navigating BRIX. But I am confident that with more time and opportunity to practice and to help each other, we will all feel more confident with the technology aspect of this project.

4) Team Collaboration and Support	Average (M)	N
Participants on my team collaborated effectively as we designed and built our project together.	4.77	26
The workshop facilities and environment were conducive to our team's work.	4.81	26
The workshop provided ample opportunity for participants to reflect on their experiences in the workshop.	4.50	26

Please add any information you wish that will help us understand your ratings above.

- We could have used more time to work in our group. Perhaps some of the plenary sessions could have been shortened.
- This has been an exceptionally effective group. We have been fortunate to have two native speakers of Russian and two native speakers of English, and exceptionally fortunate to have educational technology specialists on the team.
- We could have used a little more work time in our groups.
- need to meet again but host in other campuses
- Indeed, as I have indicated above, the working environment was excellent in terms of cooperation and collaboration by the participants. Thanks very much.
- Again, I warmly commend the expertise, support and communal feel that was provided by the team as well as their knowledge of the system we will be using. The fact they work so well together with us and others in the institute gives a very positive message to others who are new! Malo lava!
- One of the things our team needs to do is to provide a more structured forum for discussion; one with a few ground rules so that everyone participates in the discussion. We need to be both congenial and collegial with ourselves instead of just being the former. Otherwise, real work cannot get done.
- It would be nice to have more time to discuss with other participants.
- Some of us have known each other for about 20 years and have worked in some projects in the past. We also keep in touch via email messages quite often.

5) Social Events and Activities	Average (M)	N
Morning and afternoon coffee service and refreshments were satisfactory.	4.81	26
I enjoyed the Welcoming Reception on the first day (if applicable).	4.96	26
I enjoyed the Welcoming Reception on the first day (if applicable).	4.89	18
There were sufficient opportunities to network and socialize during the summer institute.	4.35	26

Please add any information you wish that will help us understand your ratings above.

- A place to sit while eating breakfast might be nice!
- Fantastic, Jim and others. As always.

- #2 and 3 are the same.
- We all appreciated the effort and imagination that was put into making us feel welcome and comfortable. I would also have welcomed a few more opportunities to get to know colleagues from other language teams.
- Jim did a wonderful job!
- can we have some hawaiian food.....!!!!!!but over all is Good....!!
- The socialisation aspect is always highly appreciative among the Samoan group during the Welcoming Reception, after the workshops times, I always enjoy their full support.
- A social evening away from the 'classroom would have been a good way to get to know others.
- The service was VERY GOOD and thank the staff and employees of the NFLRC and everyone involved with the coordination of this whole conference for the work well done.
- I think the presentations each morning could have been more interactive and hands on?
- It would've been great to have some time to share cultural or language activities with each other.
- Food and effort to provide varieties were superb. Too little time too many nice colleagues for social chats.
- Jim, thank you so much for always taking a good care of us! We really appreciate all you have done for us before and during this workshop.
- A particular thanks to the Samoan group for boosting our community sprits!

6) Future Research	Average (M)	N
The workshop prepared participants to plan ahead for performing project-related research.	4.31	26
The workshop prepared participants to plan ahead for sharing research results with professional colleagues.	4.35	26

How do you expect to share/disseminate what you have learned here (e.g., give conference presentations, collaborate with additional partners, etc.)?

- I would like to see a special plenary at flagship conference or Chinese language tacking conference can be organized to showcase our product to the field. More institutions' participation is also expected.
- We will try to collaborate with as much as possible partners in the near future.
- Will plan a panel for this experience.
- Collaboration with other Chinese Flagships, and with other language Flagships. We are planning an ACTFL panel for 2012, which will present Chinese, Russian, and Korean experiences.
- We will work to propose a collaborative grant proposal to Flagship. Also plan to pilot this cafe and present research based on it at the Chinese technology conference in May 2012 and at ACTFL 2012. Intend to showcase the projects in Chinese, Russian, and Korean Flagships and present them to the greater Flagship community.
- We plan to have a presentation on ACTFL on next year on this project.
- Perhaps as conference presentations and as a publication, if anything interesting emerges out of this project.
- Conference presentations
- conference presentations
- We will be presenting in a FLAGship panel at ACTFL in 2012.
I expect that additional publications will result from the data.
- Conference presentation, collaboration with Chinese and Korean Flagship colleagues
- We as a group plan to present at conferences and our annual Flagship meeting.

- We will collaborate with the Korean and Chinese Flagships on research that will be presented at professional conferences, such as ACTFL. We would also like to publish our findings, perhaps in the Journal of Tech and Language Learning.
- since we won't have the time to meet we can always use our online to share our thoughts. other than that we can always plan to meet in Paradise.
- I feel very much confident to share/disseminate what I have learned here like giving conference presentations, staff development at [my institution], collaborate with additional partners.
- By running a meeting for my colleagues where I will explain the whole experience and project. I will also explain to my students at [my institution] so everyone will know what is possible and the opportunities to share with other Samoan language students on an international basis. This would have to be one of the more exciting aspects of this programme.
- Continue to do what I do best - participate and facilitate our Samoan project with the help of colleagues and partners via different projects from different countries as well as continuing to elicit help from the NFLRC office.
- I think I would like to use the model internally for my own courses. I see CULTURA as consistent with my own teaching and learning styles. It is possible to think about a working paper with [a colleague at my institution] about this and hopefully present it at the teachers' conference next year.
- Hopefully we can establish an online forum for instructors alone. If not, email and vtc (via skype) will suffice for now...
- As I use it in my course and gain more experience with it I will not only share with my workshop colleagues but I will also share with my colleagues in my university. This is also something I would introduce to a local charter school that is planning to teach Samoan and other pacific languages.
- We will brief our project to other Vietnamese instructors at the GUAVA meeting in Boston in August 2011. We hope to be able to collaborate with more partners in the future.
- We have planned to share our experience with our colleagues at the annual meeting of GUAVA in August this year. I hope to have a chance to also share with my colleagues at the department of Literatures, Languages and Cultures[my institution] at one of our colloquiums.
- With other GUAVA members at our annual meeting next month.

What did you particularly like about the workshop?

- This is a great workshop which will definitely benefit the teaching of culture in language teaching and pedagogical research.
- I really like the discussion and presentation portions. We could have learned a lot of insight from other language teams.
- Very beneficial because different language teams work toward different themes and different approaches, thus very eye-opening.
- Excellent.
- Interaction with colleagues in many languages. Presentations by Stephen Tschudi.
- I really enjoy work with our group.
- Compared to 2008, this year was well structured! More time for group work and more structured discussion. The use of the worksheet was helpful to facilitate the discussion process.
- I very much appreciate the invitation and the opportunity to interact with and learn from so many fine colleagues.
I love the focus on student learning and collaborative planning.
The effort to make us welcome and comfortable was truly outstanding.
- An opportunity to learn about these projects and to design our own project based on the experience of colleagues.

- Balance of presentations with work time in groups.
- I think the opportunity to collaborate in person with my flagship colleagues was invaluable! I also appreciated the availability of facilitators and the way they assisted us in learning the brix system and advised us on curriculum development (what works or doesn't work for the cafes, for example)
- Everyone's presentation and our greeting reception
- The actual theoretical framework, the technical side of it and how the Samoan team worked together to speed up the hands-on training programme.
- The well organised programme.
 2. The well informed and prepared presenters.
 3. The friendly, warm, focused and professional environment
 4. For opening up a much needed opportunity to meet with other Samoan instructors / lecturers/teachers of the Samoan language globally.
 5. For providing Samoan students globally with a chance to get to know each other and what their aspirations might be in their search for their identity with their heritage language being an important part of those aspirations and goals.
 6. Watching other languages and their proposals and approaches was also beneficial as these gave some good possibilities that we could also follow and use.
- I liked the lectures by the coordination, they were very helpful in the continuity of our Samoan project. Also delighted with the help offered not only by coordinators and tech assistance.
- It's my second go round so I was much more comfortable this time. We have a terrific team and competent techies which will make implementation a lot smoother.
- Hands on time on the computer. I was able to both do and see how the system works.
- Group collaboration.
- I believe it was worthwhile. I would like to see a more hand on approach to the teaching than we had this time.
- I like how the tech guys were always on site to provide technical assistance.
I also like how we had our own "media" work room.
I like the website with resource links.
- I'm not unfamiliar with Cultura as I've heard about it before and some of my French colleagues at my institutions have used Cultura before. However, what I like the most during this past week is the opportunity to learn something new and to be able to come together with our team and collaborate on a project together. I also like the fact that we have many different languages, not only Asian languages but others such as Russian and Samoan teams as well.
- Knowledge, atmosphere, friendship, food
- -Materials disseminated online
 - Online resources available
 - Relaxing yet professional atmosphere
 - Beautiful campus and wonderful weather!
- opportunities to share with colleagues from distant programs

What could have been done better?

- If the host institute arrange auditing their language class, that will be wonderful.
- For one or two hours less convene, more time for project design.
- The Skype presentation on using the technology for research was not very helpful. It was too rudimentary. At this point the time would have been better spent enhancing our designs than worrying about what we might at some distant point in the future publish about them.
- Skype session with Dorothy Chun was not very successful, in my opinion. The discourse was too simplistic; pitched to the level of a first yr grad. student/ ; borderline offensive

- we develop our steps for doing this project.
- I see the value of the true-confession session, but I guess that session can be a little more structured. Perhaps have a prompt for people to answer, instead of the groups showcasing what work they have done?
- It is difficult--especially in computer training and especially when the prior experience and skills of participants are so varied--to strike a balance between presentation and doing. I don't know how to address it except to suggest a shorter introduction to one or two Cafe/Cultura/BRIX features followed by a shorter period of team work during which new questions would emerge.
- I still don't have a lot of confidence working with BRIX software. I would have benefited from a longer hands-on session on the use of BRIX.
- Give an optional campus tour on the first day.
- I understand resources are already stretched to their limit, but it would be great if someone could make a few changes to the brix system to make it a little more intuitive to use.
- refreshments and tech class
- Nothing in particular, everything was in place and on time.
- I cannot think of any aspects that needed improvement.
- None, everything was great.
- Use tables next time?
- More participation or hands on learning rather than lecture style.
- More hands-on activities
- More interactions between/amongst language groups
- I think we should have more instruction on how to navigate and use BRIX. Most of us are still not very confident in using it. If we were to continue with this project at home institutions we need to be able to be fluent (or at least proficient) with it.
- More time for technology training with fewer details as the focus.
- -Provide some more detailed training on BRIX for participants who are not "technology inclined"
- For some of us the assumptions of previous technical knowledge were a bit high.

Additional thoughts or comments?

- Follow-up conferences or workshops aiming at sharing the progress and final outcomes should be planned in order to keep the project alive and continue pushing the project to the next stage.
- Keep up the good work! Thank you!
- Excellent summer institute. I am very excited to move forward with this project. Thank you sooooo much for an excellent professional experience.
Mahalo
Let's have a follow up institute to see how all these projects evolve.
- I'd like to have hand-outs or PPT files before workshop so that I can preview.
- I am extremely pleased with the Russian product and think that it will be a valuable tool for teaching and learning and for research. I can imagine the Chinese/Korean/Russian Flagship collaboration resulting in a model that might be shared across other Flagship programs.
I am truly grateful for the invitation to participate (and the financial support without which I would not have been able to come). It's been great!
- Nothing more to say other than mahalo for giving us this opportunity!
- everything is OK just need to be more advance
- Professionally, it is a blessing to be invited and to participate at the workshop. I do look forward to implementing this ePathways Cafe for learning Samoan by the students at [my institution]. Very much appreciated.

- This was a great institute!! Mahalo and fa'afetai tele for all the fantastic work that went into this. A follow-up would be good.
Manuia tele a outou galuega-May you continue to do well in your work!
- Looking forward to a next get together on continuing the dialogue.
- Congratulations to the team; everyone performed their tasks competently and congenially. David runs a tight ship and it was great to meet Sabine. I got to know a bit more about French culture. Faafetai tele. Manuia le aso.
- Really enjoyed this workshop. Looking forward to the next one. Perhaps in a different state/province/continent...
- Thank you for the great opportunity to network and share ideas with fellow colleagues. Fa'afetai tele lava.
- Thank you very much!
- Thank you so much for everything!! We really appreciate the opportunity to participate in this workshop. We hope to have virtual post-workshop meetings IF NOT in-person.
Mahalo!!

Appendix D

Participant Roster

FACILITATORS:

Sabine Levet (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
David Hiple (National Foreign Language Resource Center)
Stephen Tschudi (National Foreign Language Resource Center)
Jim Yoshioka (National Foreign Language Resource Center)

TECHNICAL STAFF:

Richard Medina (UH Language Learning Center)
Clayton Chee (UH Language Learning Center)
Randall Parabicoli (UH Language Learning Center)
Tobias Bloyd (UH Language Learning Center)

PARTICIPANTS:

CHINESE

Dana Scott Bourgerie (Brigham Young University)
Charles Egan (San Francisco State University)
Song Jiang (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Madeline Spring (Arizona State University)
Haidan Wang (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Qin Zhang (Nanjing Flagship Center)
Jie Zhu (Arizona State University)

JAPANESE

Tomoko Iwai (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Yukiko Watanabe (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)

KOREAN

Hee-Jeong Jeong (UH Korean Language Flagship Center)
Haejin Koh (UH Korean Language Flagship Center)

RUSSIAN

Sharon Bain (Bryn Mawr College)
Sandra Freels (Portland State University)
Anna Kudyma (University of California, Los Angeles)
Billie Jo Ember (Bryn Mawr College)
Anna Tumarkin (University of Wisconsin)

SAMOAN

Edward Danielson (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Eville Feleti (American Samoa Community College)
Muliagatele Vavao Fetui (Auckland University)
Toso Foifua (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Galumalemana A. Hunkin (Victoria University)
Samalaulu Chrissy Lam Yuen (Waipahu High School)

Ta'au Lesa (Brigham Young University)
John Mayer (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Rowena Reid (Brigham Young University Hawai'i)
Fata Simanu-Klutz (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Denise Ah Sue (Farrington High School)

VIETNAMESE

Minh Hang Le (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Thuy-Kim Lê Pham (Arizona State University)
Stephen O'Harrow (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa)
Andrea Hoa Pham (University of Florida, Gainesville)
Thuy Tranviet (Cornell University)